

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and for the personal interview conducted on May 5, 2011. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and favorable reconsideration of the subject application is requested in view of the comments and/or amendments made herein.

Claims 22-24, 26-28, 30-32, 34-41 and 43-44 and remain in this application. Claims 1-21 were previously canceled. Claims 25, 29, 33 and 42 have been cancelled, and applicant retains the right to present those claims in a divisional application. Claims 45-50 are added by this amendment. No new matter has been added by the new claims or amendments.

Claims 22, 41, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement with respect to the term “quadratic”. The claim have been amended as discussed at the interview to remove that term, making the rejection moot.

The claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of references including Demerin (U.S. Patent 3,841,186), Rosenberger (US 2002/0035905), Wadell (U.S. Patent 5,186,089) and in further view of Kim *et al.* (U.S. Publication 2003/0145699). For the following reasons, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed at the personal interview, none of the reference teach any scanning an item at one cutting device, cutting the item into strips, transporting the item to another cutting device, performing additional scanning, and then cutting the strips into rectangular portions. Furthermore, it was discussed that adding such transporting to any of the references that may teach additional scanning and/or additional cutting would be improper as changing the principle of operation of the primary reference, and because there would be no motivation for adding such an additional feature where it is not found.

Accordingly, claims 22 and 41 have been amended to recite such a feature of transporting and additional/further scanning, and claim 43 is amended to recite such

transporting and “determining at least one physical attribute of the at least a portion of the strips using a second measuring device”, and thus the claims are patentable over the prior art, as discussed at the interview.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. SCAN1-41253.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

May 16, 2011

By: / Robert F. Bodi /

Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48,540

1801 East Ninth Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700